

SOME REMARKS ON THE DUNFORD-PETTIS PROPERTY

NARCISSE RANDRIANANTOANINA

ABSTRACT. Let A be the disk algebra, Ω be a compact Hausdorff space and μ be a Borel measure on Ω . It is shown that the dual of $C(\Omega, A)$ has the Dunford-Pettis property. This proved in particular that the spaces $L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)$ and $C(\Omega, A)$ have the Dunford-Pettis property.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let E be a Banach space, Ω be a compact Hausdorff space and μ be a finite Borel measure on Ω . We denote by $C(\Omega, E)$ the space of all E -valued continuous functions from Ω and for $1 \leq p < \infty$, $L^p(\mu, E)$ stands for the space of all (class of) E -valued p -Bochner integrable functions with its usual norm. A Banach space E is said to have the Dunford-Pettis property if every weakly compact operator with domain E is completely continuous (i.e., takes weakly compact sets into norm compact subsets of the range space). There are several equivalent definitions. The basic result proved by Dunford and Pettis in [7] is that the space $L^1(\mu)$ has the Dunford-Pettis property. A. Grothendieck [8] initiated the study of Dunford-Pettis property in Banach spaces and showed that $C(K)$ -spaces have this property. The Dunford-Pettis property has a rich history; the survey articles by J. Diestel [4] and A. Pełczyński [10] are excellent sources of information. In [4], it was asked if the Dunford-Pettis property can be lifted from a Banach E to $C(\Omega, E)$ or $L^1(\mu, E)$. M. Talagrand [13] constructed counterexamples for these questions so the answer is negative in general. There

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46E40, 46E25.

Key words and phrases. Bochner spaces, Dunford-Pettis property, weakly compact sets.

are however some positive results. For instance, J. Bourgain showed (among other things) in [2] that $C(\Omega, L^1)$ and $L^1(\mu, C(\Omega))$ both have the Dunford-Pettis property; K. Andrews [1] proved that if E^* has the Schur property then $L^1(\mu, E)$ has the Dunford-Pettis property. In [12], E. Saab and P. Saab observed that if $\mathcal{A}$ is a C^* -algebra with the Dunford-Pettis property then $C(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ has the Dunford-Pettis property and they asked (see [12] Question 14, p.389) if a similar result holds if one considers the disk algebra A . In this note we provide a positive answer to the above question by showing that the dual of $C(\Omega, A)$ has the Dunford-Pettis property. This implies in particular that both $L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)$ and $C(\Omega, A)$ have the Dunford-Pettis property. Our approach is to study a “Random version” of the minimum norm lifting from L^1/H_0^1 into L^1 .

The notation and terminology used and not defined in this note can be found in [5] and [6].

2. MINIMUM NORM LIFTING

Let us begin by fixing some notations. Throughout, m denotes the normalized Haar measure on the circle $\mathbb{T}$. The space H_0^1 stands for the space of integrable functions on $\mathbb{T}$ such that $\hat{f}(n) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(\theta) e^{-in\theta} dm(\theta) = 0$ for $n \leq 0$.

It is a well known fact that $A^* = L^1/H_0^1 \oplus_1 M_S(\mathbb{T})$ where $M_S(\mathbb{T})$ is the space of singular measures on $\mathbb{T}$ (see for instance [10]). Consider the quotient map $q : L^1 \rightarrow L^1/H_0^1$. This map has the following important property: for each $x \in L^1/H_0^1$, there exists a unique $f \in L^1$ so that $q(f) = x$ and $\|f\| = \|x\|$. This fact provides a well-defined map called the minimum norm lifting

$$\sigma : L^1/H_0^1 \rightsquigarrow L^1 \text{ such that } q(\sigma(x)) = x \text{ and } \|\sigma(x)\| = \|x\| .$$

One of the many important features of σ is that it preserves weakly compact subsets, namely the following was proved in [10].

Proposition 1. *If K is a relatively weakly compact subset of L^1/H_0^1 then $\sigma(K)$ is relatively weakly compact in L^1 .*

Our goal in this section is to extend the minimum norm lifting to certain classes of spaces that contains L^1/H_0^1 . In particular we will introduce a random-version of the minimum norm lifting.

First we will extend the minimum norm lifting to A^* .

We define a map $\gamma : L^1/H_0^1 \oplus_1 M_s(\mathbb{T}) \rightsquigarrow L^1 \oplus_1 M_s(\mathbb{T})$ as follows:

$$\gamma(\{x, s\}) = \{\sigma(x), s\}.$$

Clearly γ defines a minimum norm lifting from A^* into $M(\mathbb{T})$.

In order to procede to the next extension, we need the following proposition:

Proposition 2. *Let σ and γ as above then*

- a) $\sigma : L^1/H_0^1 \rightsquigarrow L^1$ *is norm-universally measurable (i.e., the inverse image of every norm Borel subset of L^1 is norm universally measurable in L^1/H_0^1);*
- b) $\gamma : A^* \rightsquigarrow M(\mathbb{T})$ *is weak*-universally measurable (i.e., the inverse image of every weak*-Borel subset of $M(\mathbb{T})$ is weak*-universally measurable in A^*).*

Proof. For a), notice that L^1/H_0^1 and L^1 are Polish spaces (with the norm topologies) and so is the product $L^1 \times L^1/H_0^1$. Consider the following subset of $L^1 \times L^1/H_0^1$:

$$\mathcal{A} = \{(f, x); q(f) = x, \|f\| = \|x\|\}.$$

The set $\mathcal{A}$ is a Borel subset of $L^1 \times L^1/H_0^1$. In fact, $\mathcal{A}$ is the intersection of the graph of q (which is closed) and the subset $\mathcal{A}_1 = \{(f, x), \|f\| = \|x\|\}$ which is also closed. Let π be the restriction on $\mathcal{A}$ of the second projection of $L^1 \times L^1/H_0^1$ onto L^1/H_0^1 . The operator π is of course continuous and hence $\pi(\mathcal{A})$ is analytic. By Theorem 8.5.3 of [3], there exists a universally measurable map $\phi : \pi(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow L^1$ whose graph belongs to $\mathcal{A}$. The existence and the uniqueness of the minimum norm lifting imply that $\pi(\mathcal{A}) = L^1/H_0^1$ and ϕ must be σ .

The proof of b) is done with simmilar argument using the fact A^* and $M(\mathbb{T})$ with the weak* topologies are countable reunion of Polish

spaces and their norms are weak*-Borel measurable. The proposition is proved. $\square$

Let (Ω, Σ, μ) be a probability space. For a measurable function $f : \Omega \rightarrow L^1/H_0^1$, the function $\omega \mapsto \sigma(f(\omega))$ ($\Omega \rightarrow L^1$) is μ -measurable by Proposition 2. We define an extension of σ on $L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)$ as follows:

$$\tilde{\sigma} : L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1) \rightsquigarrow L^1(\mu, L^1) \text{ with } \tilde{\sigma}(f)(\omega) = \sigma(f(\omega)) \text{ for } \omega \in \Omega.$$

The map $\tilde{\sigma}$ is well defined and $\|\tilde{\sigma}(f)\| = \|f\|$ for each $f \in L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)$. Also if we denote by $\tilde{q} : L^1(\mu, L^1) \rightarrow L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)$, the map $\tilde{q}(f)(\omega) = q(f(\omega))$, we get that $\tilde{q}(\tilde{\sigma}(f)) = f$.

Similarly if $f : \Omega \rightarrow A^*$ is weak*-scalarly measurable, the function $\omega \mapsto \gamma(f(\omega))$ ($\Omega \rightarrow M(\mathbb{T})$) is weak*-scalarly measurable. As above we define $\tilde{\gamma}$ as follows:

for each measure $G \in M(\Omega, A^*)$, fix $g : \Omega \rightarrow A^*$ its weak*-density with respect to its variation $|G|$. We define

$$\tilde{\gamma}(G)(A) = \text{weak}^* - \int_A \gamma(g(\omega)) d|G|(\omega) \text{ for all } A \in \Sigma.$$

Clearly $\tilde{\gamma}(G)$ is a measure and it is easy to check that $\|\tilde{\gamma}(G)\| = \|G\|$ (in fact $|\tilde{\gamma}(G)| = |G|$).

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of the following result that extends the property of σ stated in Proposition 1 to $\tilde{\sigma}$.

Theorem 1. *Let K be a relatively weakly compact subset of $L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)$. The set $\tilde{\sigma}(K)$ is relatively weakly compact in $L^1(\mu, L^1)$.*

We will need few general facts for the proof. In the sequel, we will identify (for a given Banach space F) the dual of $L^1(\mu, F)$ with the space $L^\infty(\mu, F_\sigma^*)$ of all map h from Ω to F^* that are weak*-scalarly measurable and essentially bounded with the uniform norm (see [14]).

Definition 1. *Let E be a Banach space. A series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ in E is said to be weakly unconditionally Cauchy (WUC) if for every $x^* \in E^*$, the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x^*(x_n)|$ is convergent.*

The following lemma is well known:

Lemma 1. *If S is a relatively weakly compact subset of a Banach space E , then for every WUC series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n^*$ in E^* , $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} x_n^*(x) = 0$ uniformly on S .*

The following proposition which was proved in [11] is the main ingredient for the proof of Theorem 1. For what follows $(e_n)_n$ denote the unit vector basis of c_0 and (Ω, Σ, μ) is a probability space.

Proposition 3. [11] *Let Z be a separable subspace of a real Banach space E and $(f_n)_n$ be a sequence of maps from Ω to E^* that are weak*-scalarly measurable and $\sup_n \|f_n\|_{\infty} \leq 1$. Let $a < b$ (real numbers) then:*

There exist a sequence $g_n \in \text{conv}\{f_n, f_{n+1}, \dots\}$ measurable subsets C and L of Ω with $\mu(C \cup L) = 1$ such that

- (i) *If $\omega \in C$ and $T \in \mathcal{L}(c_0, Z)$, $\|T\| \leq 1$; then for each $h_n \in \text{conv}\{g_n, g_{n+1}, \dots\}$, either $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle h_n(\omega), Te_n \rangle \leq b$ or $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle h_n(\omega), Te_n \rangle \geq a$;*
- (ii) *$\omega \in L$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for each infinite sequence of zeroes and ones Γ , there exists $T \in \mathcal{L}(c_0, Z)$, $\|T\| \leq 1$ such that for $n \geq k$,*

$$\Gamma_n = 1 \implies \langle g_n(\omega), Te_n \rangle \geq b$$

$$\Gamma_n = 0 \implies \langle g_n(\omega), Te_n \rangle \leq a .$$

We will also make use of the following fact:

Lemma 2. ([10], p.45) *Let $(U_n)_n$ be a bounded sequence of positive elements of $L^1(\mathbb{T})$. If $(U_n)_n$ is not uniformly integrable, then there exists a W.U.C. series $\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} a_{\ell}$ in the disc algebra A such that: $\limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \sup_n |\langle a_{\ell}, U_n \rangle| > 0$.*

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. Assume without loss of generality that K is a bounded subset of $L^{\infty}(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)$. The set $\tilde{\sigma}(K)$ is a bounded subset of $L^{\infty}(\mu, L^1(\mathbb{T}))$. Let $|\tilde{\sigma}(K)| = \{|\tilde{\sigma}(f)|; f \in K\}$. Notice that for each $f \in L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)$, there exists $h \in L^{\infty}(\mu, H_{\sigma}^{\infty}) = L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)^*$ with $\|h\| = 1$ and $|\tilde{\sigma}(f)(\omega)| = \tilde{\sigma}(f)(\omega) \cdot h(\omega)$ (the multiplication of the

function $\tilde{\sigma}(f)(\omega) \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ with the function $h(\omega) \in H^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$.

Consider $\varphi_n = |\tilde{\sigma}(f_n)|$ be a sequence of $L^1(\mu, L^1(\mathbb{T}))$ with $(f_n)_n \subset K$ and choose $(h_n)_n \in L^\infty(\mu, H^\infty)$ so that $\varphi_n(\omega) = \tilde{\sigma}(f_n)(\omega) \cdot h_n(\omega) \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 3. *There exists $\psi_n \in \text{conv}\{\varphi_n, \varphi_{n+1}, \dots\}$ so that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \psi_n(\omega), Te_n \rangle \text{ exists for each } T \in \mathcal{L}(c_0, A) .$$

To prove the lemma, let $(a(k), b(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an enumeration of all pairs of rationals with $a(k) < b(k)$. We will apply Proposition 3 successively starting from $(\varphi_n)_n$ for $E = C(\mathbb{T})$ and $Z = A$. Note that Proposition 3 is valid only for real Banach spaces so we will separate the real part and the imaginary part.

Inductively, we construct sequences $(\varphi_n^{(k)})_{n \geq 1}$ and measurable subsets C_k, L_k of Ω satisfying:

- (i) $C_{k+1} \subseteq C_k, L_k \subseteq L_{k+1}, \mu(C_k \cup L_k) = 1$
- (ii) $\forall \omega \in C_k$ and $T \in \mathcal{L}(c_0, A), \|T\| \leq 1$ and $j \geq k$, either

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Re} \langle \varphi_n^{(j)}(\omega), Te_n \rangle &\leq b(k) \quad \text{or} \\ \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Re} \langle \varphi_n^{(j)}(\omega), Te_n \rangle &\geq a(k) \end{aligned}$$

- (iii) $\forall \omega \in L_k$, there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for each Γ infinite sequences of zeroes and ones, there exists $T \in \mathcal{L}(c_0, A), \|T\| \leq 1$ such that if $n \geq \ell$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_n = 1 &\Rightarrow \text{Re} \langle \varphi_n^{(k)}(\omega), Te_n \rangle \geq b(k) \\ \Gamma_n = 0 &\Rightarrow \text{Re} \langle \varphi_n^{(k)}(\omega), Te_n \rangle \leq a(k) ; \end{aligned}$$

- (iv) $\varphi_n^{(k+1)} \in \text{conv}\{\varphi_n^{(k)}, \varphi_{n+1}^{(k)}, \dots\}$.

Again this is just an application of Proposition 3 starting from the sequence $\Omega \rightarrow C(\mathbb{T})^* (\omega \mapsto \text{Re}(\varphi_n(\omega)))$ where $\langle \text{Re}(\varphi_n(\omega)), f \rangle = \text{Re} \langle \varphi_n(\omega), f \rangle \forall f \in C(\mathbb{T})$. Let $C = \bigcap_k C_k$ and $L = \bigcup_k L_k$.

Claim: $\mu(L) = 0$.

To see the claim, assume that $\mu(L) > 0$. Since $L = \bigcup_k L_k$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\mu(L_k) > 0$. Consider $\varphi_n^k \in \text{conv}\{\varphi_n, \varphi_{n+1}, \dots\}$ and let $\mathcal{P} = \{k \in \mathbb{N}, b(k) > 0\}$ and $\mathcal{N} = \{k \in \mathbb{N}, a(k) < 0\}$. Clearly $\mathbb{N} = \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{N}$.

Let us assume first that $k \in \mathcal{P}$. Using (iii) with $\Gamma = (1, 1, 1, \dots)$, for each $\omega \in L_k$, there exists $T \in \mathcal{L}(c_0, A)$, $\|T\| \leq 1$ so that $\text{Re}\langle \varphi_n^{(k)}(\omega), T e_n \rangle \geq b(k)$. Using similar argument as in [11] Lemma 4., one can construct a map $T : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(c_0, A)$ with:

- a) $\omega \mapsto T(\omega)e$ is measurable for every $e \in c_0$;
- b) $\|T(\omega)\| \leq 1 \ \forall \ \omega \in \Omega$ and $T(\omega) = 0$ for $\omega \in \Omega \setminus L_k$.
- c) $\text{Re}\langle \varphi_n^{(k)}(\omega), T(\omega)e_n \rangle \geq b(k) \ \forall \ \omega \in L_k$.

So we get that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{L_k} \text{Re}\langle \varphi_n^{(k)}(\omega), T(\omega)e_n \rangle d\mu(\omega) \geq b(k)\mu(L_k)$$

which implies that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{L_k} \langle \varphi_n^{(k)}(\omega), T(\omega)e_n \rangle d\mu(\omega) \right| \geq b(k)\mu(L_k) .$$

If $k \in \mathcal{N}$, we repeat the same argument with $\Gamma = (0, 0, 0, \dots)$ to get that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{L_k} \langle \varphi_n^{(k)}(\omega), T(\omega)e_n \rangle d\mu(\omega) \right| \geq |a(k)|\mu(L_k) .$$

So in both cases, if $\delta = \max(b(k)\mu(L_k), |a(k)|\mu(L_k))$, there exists a map $T : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(c_0, A)$ (measurable for the strong operator topology) so that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{L_k} \langle \varphi_n^{(k)}(\omega), T(\omega)e_n \rangle d\mu(\omega) \right| \geq \delta . \quad (1)$$

To get the contradiction, let

$$\varphi_n^{(k)} = \sum_{i=p_n}^{q_n} \lambda_i^n |\tilde{\sigma}(f_i)(\omega)| = \sum_{i=p_n}^{q_n} \lambda_i^n \tilde{\sigma}(f_i)(\omega) \cdot h_i(\omega)$$

with $\sum_{i=p_n}^{q_n} \lambda_i^n = 1$, $p_1 < q_1 < p_2 < q_2 < \dots$ and $h_i \in L^\infty(\mu, H_\sigma^\infty)$.

Condition (1) is equivalent to:

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{i=p_n}^{q_n} \lambda_i^n \int_{L_k} \langle \tilde{\sigma}(f_i)(\omega) \cdot h_i(\omega), T(\omega)e_n \rangle d\mu(\omega) \right| \geq \delta .$$

Therefore there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for each $n \geq N$,

$$\sum_{i=p_n}^{q_n} \lambda_i^n \left| \int_{L_k} \langle \tilde{\sigma}(f_i)(\omega) \cdot h_i(\omega), T(\omega)e_n \rangle d\mu(\omega) \right| \geq \delta/2;$$

for each $n \geq N$, choose $i(n) \in [p_n, q_n]$ so that

$$\left| \int_{L_k} \langle \tilde{\sigma}(f_{i(n)})(\omega) \cdot h_{i(n)}(\omega), T(\omega)e_n \rangle d\mu(\omega) \right| \geq \delta/2$$

and we obtain that for each $n \geq N$,

$$\left| \int_{L_k} \langle \sigma(f_{i(n)}(\omega)), T(\omega)e_n \cdot h_{i(n)}(\omega) \rangle d\mu(\omega) \right| \geq \delta/2. \quad (2)$$

Notice that for every $\omega \in \Omega$, $T(\omega)e_n \in A$ and $h_{i(n)}(\omega) \in H^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ so the product $T(\omega)e_n \cdot h_{i(n)}(\omega) \in H^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ and therefore

$$\langle \sigma(f_{i(n)}(\omega)), T(\omega)e_n \cdot h_{i(n)}(\omega) \rangle = \langle f_{i(n)}(\omega), T(\omega)e_n \cdot h_{i(n)}(\omega) \rangle.$$

For $n \geq N$, fix

$$\phi_n(\omega) = \begin{cases} T(\omega)e_n \cdot h_{i(n)}(\omega) & \omega \in L_k \\ 0 & \omega \notin L_k \end{cases}.$$

If we set $\phi_n = 0$ for $n < N$ then the series $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \phi_i$ is a W.U.C. series in $L^\infty(\mu, H_\sigma^\infty)$: to see this notice that for each $\omega \in \Omega$, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} T(\omega)e_n$ is a W.U.C. series in A (hence in $C(\mathbb{T})$) so $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |T(\omega)e_n|$ is a W.U.C. series in $C(\mathbb{T})$. Now let $x \in L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)$ (the predual of $L^\infty(\mu, H_\sigma^\infty)$) and fix $v \in L^1(\mu, L^1)$ with $\tilde{q}(v) = x$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\langle \phi_n, x \rangle| &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\langle \phi_n, v \rangle| \\ &= \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} |\langle T(\cdot)e_n \cdot h_{i(n)}(\cdot) \cdot \chi_{L_k}(\cdot), v \rangle| \\ &\leq \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \|h_{i(n)}\| \langle |T(\cdot)e_n|, |v| \rangle \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle |T(\cdot)e_n|, |v| \rangle < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Now (2) is equivalent to: for each $n \geq N$,

$$\left| \langle \phi_n, f_{i(n)} \rangle \right| \geq \delta/2$$

which is a contradiction since $\{f_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq K$ is relatively weakly compact and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi_n$ is a W.U.C. series. The claim is proved.

To complete the proof of the lemma, let us fix a sequence $(\xi_n)_n$ so that $\xi_n \in \text{conv}\{\varphi_n^{(k)}, \varphi_{n+1}^{(k)}, \dots\}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we get by (ii) that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Re}\langle \xi_n(\omega), Te_n \rangle$ exists for every $T \in \mathcal{L}(c_0, A)$; we repeat the same argument as above for the imaginary part (starting from $(\xi_n)_n$) to get a sequence $(\psi_n)_n$ with $\psi_n \in \text{conv}\{\xi_n, \xi_{n+1}, \dots\}$ so that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Im}\langle \psi_n(\omega), Te_n \rangle$ exists for every $T \in \mathcal{L}(c_0, A)$. The lemma is proved.

To finish the proof of the theorem, we will show that for a.e. ω , the sequence $(\psi_n(\omega))_{n \geq 1}$ is uniformly integrable. If not, there would be a measurable subset Ω' of Ω with $\mu(\Omega') > 0$ and $(\psi_n(\omega))_{n \geq 1}$ is not uniformly integrable for each $\omega \in \Omega'$. Hence by Lemma 2, for each $\omega \in \Omega'$, there exists $T \in \mathcal{L}(c_0, A)$ so that:

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_n |\langle \psi_n(\omega), Te_m \rangle| > 0.$$

So there would be increasing sequences (n_j) and (m_j) of integers, $\delta > 0$ so that $|\langle \psi_{n_j}(\omega), Te_{m_j} \rangle| > \delta \forall j \in \mathbb{N}$; choose an operator $S : c_0 \rightarrow c_0$ so that $Se_{n_j} = e_{m_j}$; we have $|\langle \psi_{n_j}(\omega), TSe_{n_j} \rangle| > \delta$. But by Lemma 3, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\langle \psi_n(\omega), TSe_n \rangle|$ exists so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\langle \psi_n(\omega), TSe_n \rangle| > \delta$. We have just shown that for each $\omega \in \Omega'$, there exists an operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(c_0, A)$ so that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\langle \psi_n(\omega), Te_n \rangle| > 0$ and same as before, we can choose the operator T measurably, i.e., there exists $T : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(c_0, A)$, measurable for the strong operator topology so that:

- a) $\|T(\omega)\| \leq 1$ for every $\omega \in \Omega$;
- b) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\langle \psi_n(\omega), T(\omega)e_n \rangle| = \delta(\omega) > 0$ for $\omega \in \Omega'$;
- c) $T(\omega) = 0$ for $\omega \notin \Omega'$.

These conditions imply that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int |\langle \psi_n(\omega), T(\omega)e_n \rangle| d\mu(\omega) = \int_{\Omega'} \delta(\omega) = \delta > 0$$

and we can find measurable subsets $(B_n)_n$ so that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{B_n} \langle \psi_n(\omega), T(\omega)e_n \rangle d\mu(\omega) \right| > \frac{\delta}{4}$$

and one can get a contradiction using similar construction as in the proof of Lemma 3.

We have just shown that for each sequence $(f_n)_n$ in K , there exists a sequence $\psi_n \in \text{conv}(|\tilde{\sigma}(f_n)|, |\tilde{\sigma}(f_{n+1})|, \dots)$ so that for a.e $\omega \in \Omega$, the set $\{\psi_n(\omega), n \geq 1\}$ is relatively weakly compact in $L^1(\mathbb{T})$. By Ulger's criteria of weak compactness for Bochner space ([15]), the set $|\tilde{\sigma}(K)|$ is relatively weakly compact in $L^1(\mu, L^1(\mathbb{T})) = L^1(\Omega \times \mathbb{T}, \mu \otimes m)$. Hence $\tilde{\sigma}(K)$ is uniformly integrable in $L^1(\Omega \times \mathbb{T}, \mu \otimes m)$ which is equivalent to $\tilde{\sigma}(K)$ is relatively weakly compact in $L^1(\mu, L^1(\mathbb{T}))$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Theorem 1. can be extended to the case of spaces of measures.

Corollary 1. *Let K be a relatively weakly compact subset of $M(\Omega, A^*)$. The set $\tilde{\gamma}(K)$ is relatively weakly compact in $M(\Omega, M(\mathbb{T}))$.*

The following lemma will be used for the proof.

Lemma 4. *Let $\Pi : M(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow L^1$ be the usual projection. The map Π is weak* to norm universally measurable.*

Proof. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq k < 2^n$, let $D_{n,k} = \{e^{it}; \frac{(k-1)\pi}{2^{n-1}} \leq t < \frac{k\pi}{2^{n-1}}\}$. Define for each measure λ in $M(\mathbb{T})$, $R_n(\lambda) = g_n \in L^1$ be the function $\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} 2^n \lambda(D_{n,k}) \chi_{D_{n,k}}$. It is not difficult to see that the map $\lambda \mapsto \lambda(D_{n,k})$ is weak*-Borel, so the map R_n is weak* Borel measurable as a map from $M(\mathbb{T})$ into L^0 . But $R_n(\lambda)$ converges a.e. to the derivative of λ with respect to m . If $R(\lambda)$ is such limit, the map R is weak* Borel measurable and therefore $M_s(\mathbb{T}) = R^{-1}(\{0\})$ is weak* Borel measurable. Now fix B a Borel measurable subset of L^1 . Since L^1 is a Polish space and the inclusion map of L^1 into $M(\mathbb{T})$ is norm to weak* continuous, B is a weak* analytic subset of $M(\mathbb{T})$ which implies that $\Pi^{-1}(B) = B + M_s(\mathbb{T})$ is a weak* analytic (and hence weak* universally measurable) subset of $M(\mathbb{T})$. Thus the proof of the lemma is complete. $\square$

To prove the corollary, let K be a relatively weakly compact subset of $M(\Omega, A^*)$. There exists a measure μ in (Ω, Σ) so that K is uniformly continuous with respect to μ . For each $G \in K$, choose $\omega \mapsto g(\omega)(\Omega \rightarrow A^*)$ a weak*-density of G with respect to μ . Let $g(\omega) = \{g_1(\omega), g_2(\omega)\}$ the unique decomposition of $g(\omega)$ in $L^1/H_0^1 \oplus_1 M_s(\mathbb{T})$. We claim that the function $\omega \mapsto g_1(\omega)$ belongs to $L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)$. To see this, notice that the function $\omega \mapsto \gamma(g(\omega)) = \{\sigma(g_1(\omega)), g_2(\omega)\}$ is a weak*-density of $\tilde{\gamma}(G)$ with respect to μ . By the above lemma, $\omega \mapsto \Pi(\gamma(g(\omega))) = \sigma(g_1(\omega))$ ($\Omega \rightarrow L^1$) is norm measurable and hence $\omega \mapsto g_1(\omega)$ ($\Omega \rightarrow L^1/H_0^1$) is norm measurable and the claim is proved.

We get that $g(\omega) = \{g_1(\omega), g_2(\omega)\}$ where $g_1(\cdot) \in L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)$ and $g_2(\cdot)$ defines a measure in $M(\Omega, M(\mathbb{T}))$. So $K = K_1 + K_2$ where K_1 is a relatively weakly compact subset of $L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)$ and K_2 is a relatively weakly compact subset of $M(\Omega, M(\mathbb{T}))$. It is now easy to check $\tilde{\gamma}(K) = \tilde{\sigma}(K_1) + K_2$ and an appeal to Theorem 2. completes the proof.

Remark 1. *Hensgen initiated the study of possible existence and uniqueness of minimum norm lifting σ from $L^1(X)/H_0^1(X)$ to $L^1(X)$ in [9]. He proved (see Theorem 3.6 of [9]) that if X is reflexive then $\sigma(K)$ is relatively weakly compact in $L^1(X)$ if and only if K is relatively weakly compact in $L^1(X)/H_0^1(X)$.*

3. THE DUNFORD-PETTIS PROPERTY

In this section we prove our main results concerning the spaces $L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)$ and $C(\Omega, A)$. Let us first recall some characterizations of the Dunford-Pettis property that are useful for our purpose.

Proposition 4. [4] *Each of the following conditions is equivalent to the Dunford-Pettis property for a Banach space X*

- (i) *If $(x_n)_n$ is a weakly Cauchy sequence in X and $(x_n^*)_n$ is a weakly null sequence in X^* then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n^*(x_n) = 0$;*
- (ii) *If $(x_n)_n$ is a weakly null sequence in X and $(x_n^*)_n$ is a weakly Cauchy sequence in X^* then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n^*(x_n) = 0$.*

It is immediate from the above proposition that if X^* has the Dunford-Pettis property then so does X .

We are now ready to present our main theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let Ω be a compact Hausdorff space, the dual of $C(\Omega, A)$ has the Dunford-Pettis property.*

Proof. Let $(G_n)_n$ and $(\xi_n)_n$ be weakly null sequences of $M(\Omega, A^*)$ and $M(\Omega, A^*)^*$ respectively and consider the inclusion map $J : C(\Omega, A) \rightarrow C(\Omega, C(\mathbb{T}))$. By Corollary 1, the set $\{\tilde{\gamma}(G_n); n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is relatively weakly compact in $M(\Omega, M(\mathbb{T}))$.

Claim: for each $G \in M(\Omega, A^*)$ and $\xi \in M(\Omega, A^*)^*$, $\langle G, \xi \rangle = \langle \tilde{\gamma}(G), J^{**}(\xi) \rangle$.

Notice that the claim is trivially true for $G \in M(\Omega, A^*)$ and $f \in C(\Omega, A)$. For $\xi \in M(\Omega, A^*)^*$, fix a net $(f_\alpha)_\alpha$ of elements of $C(\Omega, A)$ that converges to ξ for the weak*-topology. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle G, \xi \rangle &= \lim_\alpha \langle G, f_\alpha \rangle \\ &= \lim_\alpha \langle \tilde{\gamma}(G), J(f_\alpha) \rangle \\ &= \langle \tilde{\gamma}(G), J^{**}(\xi) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

and the claim is proved.

To complete the proof of the theorem, we use the claim to get that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\langle G_n, \xi_n \rangle = \langle \tilde{\gamma}(G_n), J^{**}(\xi_n) \rangle.$$

Since $(J^{**}(\xi_n))_n$ is a weakly null sequence in $M(\Omega, M(\mathbb{T}))^*$ and $\{\tilde{\gamma}(G_n); n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is relatively weakly compact, we apply the fact that $M(\Omega, M(\mathbb{T}))$ has the Dunford-Pettis property (it is an L^1 -space) to conclude that the sequence $(\langle \tilde{\gamma}(G_n), J^{**}(\xi_n) \rangle)_n$ converges to zero and so does the sequence $(\langle G_n, \xi_n \rangle)_n$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Corollary 2. *Let Ω be a compact Hausdorff space and μ be a finite Borel measure on Ω . The following spaces have the Dunford-Pettis property: $L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)$, $L^1(\mu, A^*)$ and $C(\Omega, A)$.*

Proof. For the space $L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)$, it is enough to notice that the space $L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1)$ is complemented in $M(\Omega, L^1/H_0^1)$ which in turn is a complemented subspace of $M(\Omega, A^*)$.

For $L^1(\mu, A^*)$, we use the fact that $A^* = L^1/H_0^1 \oplus_1 M_S(\mathbb{T})$. It is clear that $L^1(\mu, A^*) = L^1(\mu, L^1/H_0^1) \oplus_1 L^1(\mu, M_S(\mathbb{T}))$ and since $L^1(\mu, M_S(\mathbb{T}))$ is an L^1 -space, the space $L^1(\mu, A^*)$ has the Dunford-Pettis property. $\square$

Acknowledgements . *The author would like to thank Nigel Kalton for showing him the argument used in Lemma 4 and Wolfgang Hensgen for some fruitful comments.*

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Andrews. *Dunford-Pettis set in the space of Bochner integrable functions*. Math. Ann., **241**:35–42, (1979).
- [2] J. Bourgain. *New Classes of $\mathcal{L}^p$ -spaces*. Lecture notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, **889**, (1981).
- [3] D.L. Cohn. *Measure Theory*. Birkhäuser, Basel, Stuttgart, (1980).
- [4] J. Diestel. *The Dunford-Pettis property*. Contemp. Math., **2**:15–60, (1980).
- [5] J. Diestel. *Sequences and Series in Banach Spaces*, volume **92** of Graduate Text in Mathematics. Springer Verlag, New York, first edition, (1984).
- [6] J. Diestel and Jr. J.J. Uhl. *Vector Measures*, volume **15** of Math Surveys. AMS, Providence, RI, (1977).
- [7] N. Dunford and B.J. Pettis. *Linear operators on summable functions*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **47**:323–392, (1940).
- [8] A. Grothendieck. *Sur les applications lineaires faiblement compactes d'espaces de type $C(K)$* . Canad. J. Math., **5**:129–173, (1953).
- [9] W. Hensgen. *Contributions to the geometry of vector-valued H^∞ and L^1/H_0^1 spaces*. Habilitationsschrift, Universität Regensburg, 1992.
- [10] A. Pelczyński. *Banach spaces of analytic functions and absolutely summing operators*, volume **30** of CBMS conference series in mathematics. Amer. Math. Soc., (1977).
- [11] N. Randrianantoanina. *Pelczyński's property (V) on spaces of vector-valued functions*. Submitted for publication.
- [12] E. Saab and P. Saab. *Stability problems in Banach spaces*. Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., **136**:367–394, (1992).
- [13] M. Talagrand. *La Propriété de Dunford-Pettis dans $C(K, E)$ et $L_1(E)$* . Israel J. of Math., **44**:317–321, (1983).
- [14] A. Tulecea and C. Ionescu. *Topics in the theory of lifting*, volume **48** of Ergebnisse der Mathematik und Ihrer Grenzgebiete. Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, first edition, (1969).
- [15] A. Ulger. *Weak compactness in $L^1(\mu, X)$* . Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **113**:143–149, (1991).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN,
AUSTIN, TX 78712-1082

E-mail address: `nrandri@math.utexas.edu`